



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,167	07/05/2001	Roman Fuchs	ATM-2129-1	9618

7590 09/26/2002
Fisher Christen & Sabol
1725 K Street NW
Suite 1401
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

NAKARANI, DHIRAJLAL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

12

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/898,167

Applicant(s)

FUCHS ET AL.

Examiner

D. S. Nakarani

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective (see 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414) because of the following:

It does not identify the foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate on which priority is claimed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55, and any foreign application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed, by specifying the application number, country, day, month and year of its filing.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue oath under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the oath is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

3. The amendment filed July 2, 2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Column 8, line 28, changing the phrase "protective layers are typically 1 nm thick" to the phrase -- protective layers are typically from 1 nm thick -- introduces new matter because the addition of the word "from" to the phrase allows the thickness range of the protective layers to open ended while the original phrase limits to "1 nm thick protective layers".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

4. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being based upon new matter added to the patent for which reissue is sought. The added material which is not supported by the prior patent is as follows:

Column 8, line 28, changing the phrase "protective layers are typically 1 nm thick" to the phrase -- protective layers are typically from 1 nm thick -- introduces new matter because the addition of the word "from" to the phrase allows the thickness range of the protective layers to open ended while the original phrase limits to "1 nm thick protective layers".

5. Applicant's arguments filed July 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding insertion of word "from" at column 8, applicants' state that it is a translation error because translator did not translate the German word "von" in the German language priority Swiss applications so the English translation comprising the U.S. Application underlying U. S. Patent No. 5,919,561 left out the English word "from". In support for correction, applicants have provided certified translations of priority documents and cited case law *In re Oda et al.*, 170 USPQ 268 (C.C.P.A. 1971).

These arguments are unpersuasive because as per MPEP 2163.07 (section II- Obvious Errors), which state states "[w]here a non-English foreign priority document under 35 U.S.C. 119 is of record in the application file, applicant may not rely on the disclosure of that document to support correction of an error in the pending application. *Ex parte Bondiou*, 132 USPQ 356 (Bd. App. 1961). This prohibition applies regardless of the language of the foreign priority documents because a claim for priority is simply a claim for the benefit of an earlier filing date for subject matter that is common to two or more applications, and does not serve to incorporate the content of the priority document in the application in which the claim for priority is made." Additionally,


Art Unit: 1773

applicants' reliance on *In re Oda et al.* does not appear to be persuasive because the fact scenario in *Oda* was vastly different. In the opinion of *Oda*, the court found that not only was there a translation error, but also evidence in the application as originally filed that the term "nitrous acid" was originally mistyped based on the following: (a) the specific gravity disclosed in the original application; (b) the reaction disclosed in the original application; (c) the fact that nitrous acid is undesirable for the nitration of amines; and (d) nitrous acid would not function in the process disclosed in *Oda*. The present Reissue does not contain such a fact situation based on the application as originally filed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. S. Nakarani whose telephone number is (703) 308-2413. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J. Thibodeau, can be reached on (703) 308-2367. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


D. S. Nakarani
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773